

Appn No. 09/721,858
Arad. Dated September 6, 2004
Response to Office action of XX, 2004

8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35USC § 102

In this section, the Examiner has objected to claim 19 as not being novel in light of Hartstein et al. In view of the Examiner's objections, claim 19 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35USC § 103

In this section, the Examiner has objected to claims 1 to 19 as being obvious in light of Hartstein et al and Tabata et al. In view of the Examiner's objections, the claims have been amended to introduce further distinctions over the prior art. As a result we believe that all claims are novel and inventive.

Firstly we respectfully submit that a person skilled in the art would not consider combining the teachings of Hartstein et al and Tabata et al. Hartstein et al describes a system including a refrigerator-based, computer task controller, wherein a laptop sized computer is housed within a recessed well in the refrigerator door. A user interacts with the computer to perform a plurality of software tasks. The system also includes a printer which can print out recipes.

Tabata et al describes a system for preparing hypertext documents. The system involves determining the graphic design activity made by a user on a page, including the user marking the form, and then scanning the form, including the barcode and marked area, in order to determine which zone the marking is contained within. After determining the zone that has been marked, the corresponding hyperlinked document is printed by a printer.

Therefore, we respectfully submit that it would not be obvious for someone skilled in the art to consider combining Hartstein et al with Tabata et al, as there is no common technology between the two systems other than a printer. Hartstein et al describes a refrigerator with a computer, and a specific embodiment at lines 54 and 55 of column including a printer for printing lists of chores, messages and recipes, whereas Tabata et al relates to printing hyperlinked pages such as Internet pages.

Hartstein et al already provides an input mechanism such as a keyboard. Therefore we respectfully submit that it would seem difficult why a skilled person would be urged to incorporate the input system taught by Tabata et al. Hartstein et al fails to suggest any interaction with the printed recipes, and therefore it would be not be obvious to combine the teachings of Tabata et al with Hartstein et al. Even if the documents were combined, the system formed would still fail to teach the sensing device sensing coded data when placed in an operative position relative to the form.

Appln No. 09/721,858
Amdt. Dated September 6, 2004
Response to Office action of XX, 2004

9

In any event, in order to obtain speedy allowance, claim 1 has now been amended to specify that the at least one form includes a plurality of interactive elements, and that the sensing device generates indicating data by sensing coded data, where the indicating data is indicative of an identity of the form and a selected interactive element. A basis for this can be found at line 15 onwards of page 17 which describes how a tag (coded data) may have an identity indicative of an interactive element. This feature of the indicating data being indicative of an identity of the form and a selected interactive element is not shown by the prior art, and we respectfully submit renders the claim novel and inventive.

Hartstein et al describes a refrigerator including a printer for printing information, such as lists of chores, messages and recipes on a medium such as paper and does not describe the use of printed forms including coded data or interaction with printed forms using a sensing device. Tabata et al describes a system that allows the user to mark the page with a pen, and then scan the entire page with a separate scanner, such that the identity of the page can be determined from the scanned bar code and the zone, within which the marking is made, can be determined.

This does not correspond to a sensing device which when placed in an operative position relative to one of the interactive elements, generates indicating data by sensing coded data associated with the interactive element, and the indicating data being indicative of an identity of the form and a selected interactive element, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, combining the teachings of Hartstein et al with Tabata et al will only form a refrigerator including a printer that requires a two step process to first mark the printed page to make a selection, and then scan the marked page, to determine the identity of the page and the zone or element marked. Thus the prior art combination requires that the entirety of the document be scanned and that subsequent image processing is performed in order to determine the marked element on the page. This does not work by sensing coded data associated with an interactive element when the sensing device is provided at an operative position corresponding to the interactive element. Furthermore, the element to be selected may need to be entirely selected, such as being circled, in order for the system to determine using complex image processing which element has been marked by the user.

In contrast, the current invention does not require the additional step of image processing since the indicating data is indicative of the interactive element and detected when the sensing device is placed in an operative position with respect to the interactive element, thus eliminating the need for complex image processing. Also, the current invention does not require the entire document to be scanned, since the sensing device is placed in an operative position relative to the page such that only a portion of the coded data may be scanned in order to determine the identity of the form and the interactive element selected.

The current system is cost effective, as a separate scanner and marking device is not required. Additionally, the current system is time efficient since a two step process of marking and then scanning is reduced into a one step process where the marking and scanning are performed simultaneously by the user. Furthermore, the current system provides the advantage of being more accurate compared to the prior art, which requires the scanning of the entire document and performing image processing to determine the mark made on the page. It will be appreciated that image processing can be processor intensive, costly, and inaccurate in situations where the document is skewed or not scanned correctly. Also, the current invention provides ease of use to the user, as the scanning device is able to

Appn No. 09/721,858
Amdt. Dated September 6, 2004
Response to Office action of XX, 2004

10

scan the coded data while simultaneously being operatively used relative to the page to select an interactive element.

Therefore we respectfully submit that claim 1 provides numerous advantages over the combined teachings of Tabata et al and Hartstein et al. Additionally, the combined teachings of Tabata et al and Hartstein et al fail to suggest generating indicating data indicative of both the identity of the form and the interactive element selected. Therefore we respectfully submit that claim 1 is inventive in light of the prior art.

We have additionally included a new independent claim 20 which includes the sensing device generating indicating data by sensing coded data, where the indicating data is indicative of an identity of the form and the sensing device's position relative to the form. A basis for this can be found at page 31 onwards. This feature of the indicating data being indicative of an identity of the form and the sensing device's position relative to the form is not shown by the prior art, and we respectfully submit renders claim 20 novel and inventive.

Tabata et al describes using a marking device in order to mark on the page in order to indicate a user selection. The user must then scan the document in order to determine the marking which was previously made by the user using the marking device.

However, in contrast the current invention is significantly different from the combined teachings of Tabata et al and Hartstein et al as the position of the sensing device relative to the form can be determined, which the combined documents fail to teach. The sensing device when used in an operative position can determine the current position of the sensing device relative to the form using the generated indicating data. However, the prior art only can determine the area which a marking device has been used relative to the page in the past.

The features included in claim 20 provide similar advantages that are provided above for claim 1. Therefore we respectfully submit that claim 20 is inventive in light of Tabata et al and Hartstein et al.

Appin No. 09/721,858
Amdt. Dated September 6, 2004
Response to Office action of XX. 2004

11

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 20, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762